

ATTACHMENT G

Secretary of State's Council on Library Development

Minutes

Kirkpatrick State Information Center
Secretary of State Conference Room
Jefferson City, MO

September 9, 2005

Members present: Carr, Fares, Sundermeyer, Rickerson, Shaw, Maxwell, Darst, Wilke,
Morrow, Fuchs, Mullaly-Quijas, Fridley, Bray, Moore

Absent: Baker, Hogerty, LeVota, Mayer, Walker, Burson

Guest Attending: Paul White – Mid-Continent Public Library
Tracy Byerly - Missouri Library Network Corp.
Margaret Booker – Missouri Library Association
Wicky Sleight – Kirkwood Public Library
Glenda Davis-Hunt – Adair County Library
Carol Grimes – Springfield-Greene County Library
Jeanne Sullivan - MOREnet

Staff present: Parker, B. Reading, Smith, Schertzer, Very, Sites, Dentner, M.
Reading, Hansen, Albers

Carr called the meeting to order at 9:30 a.m.

Council members and guests were introduced.

Carr thanked Parker for the new member orientation which took place on Thursday evening. The session was informative and helpful to the new members attending.

B. Reading introduced the new Library Services and Technology Act Grant Officer, Diana Very.

Patron Survey by Wolfner Library for the Blind and Physically Handicapped – Richard Smith, Director

Smith gave a brief description of Wolfner Library and its services. The Library of Congress has Wolfner described as a medium-to-small library, sending an average of 2,000 books a day.

Wolfner is required by the Library of Congress standards to conduct a patron survey every two years. The recent survey responses were very favorable for Wolfner.

Wilke asked when the “flash memory” system would be available. Smith said the design is currently in progress. The projected date for implementation is 2008. The electronic books are scheduled to be available in 2007. Smith gave a brief overview of how the “flash memory” system will work. Parker emphasized the recordings would be in human voice, not a mechanical one.

Library Services and Technology Act (LSTA) Library Survey – Barbara Reading, Director of Library Development

Parker said Robin Carnahan, as a new Secretary of State, wanted to know about the program’s priorities and parameters and if it is satisfying the needs of libraries.

B. Reading spoke on the results of the LSTA library survey. She said each state is required to submit a five-year plan on how LSTA funds will be used. Missouri is currently at mid-point of the five-year plan. This is a good time to access of where Missouri is on the projects, the types of grants to date, and consideration of revisions.

LSTA has three broad purposes:

- To promote improvement in library services in all types of libraries.
- To facilitate access to resources in all types of libraries.
- To encourage resource sharing in all types of libraries for the purpose of achieving economical and efficient delivery of library services to the public.

The survey was open for a two-week time period. Libraries were asked the satisfaction level for five areas of statewide projects and ten types of grants. In each area the library was asked to submit additional comments. The survey concluded with two open-ended questions. 1,260 announcements were sent out via e-mail as well as regular mail. There were only 79 responses to the survey.

The statewide projects with the highest ratings were:

- Continuing Education/Training
- ShowMe the World – highest ratings with the least “no opinion”
- In general, there were many “no opinion” on the survey for Videoconferencing, Literacy, Collection Development, and Virtually Missouri.

The highest ratings for the LSTA grants were:

- Training & Professional Development
- ShowMe Steps to Career Development
- Technology Enhancement (had the highest ratio of positive ratings)

The lowest rated was the After School Connections/Discovery (but also 23/55 was satisfied and 24 had no opinion).

There were a total of 40 general comments. 26 of those were generally positive and seven were negative. Some of the comments were:

- The libraries had an appreciation of the ability to serve patrons better.
- There is improvement and expansion of services due to LSTA grants and statewide projects.
- Support from LSTA frees up local funding for services and/or collections.
- LSTA programs help level the playing field.

B. Reading asked if the Council had questions regarding the survey results. Mullally-Quijas asked if the State Library planned on exploring the reasons behind the “no opinion” comments on the survey. B. Reading said the survey as a whole does require a good amount of follow-up; there is a plan to speak to several library groups and ask their opinions on where they agree, disagree, and/or concur. This will generate more reaction.

Rickerson said one way to explain the high level of “no opinion” responses is those libraries that have never applied or received specific grants wouldn’t be able to comment.

Fares asked the amount of the LSTA funds. Parker said the appropriation from the federal government is approximately \$3 million. Of that amount the legislature appropriates between \$800,000 and \$900,000 for services from the State Library, salaries, and other expenses. Over \$2,000,000 is divided between statewide projects and grants. At the Council’s December meeting the State Library will present recommendations for the uses of the funds.

Fuchs asked if any current projects would be changed or eliminated. Parker said the State Library would present recommendations to the Council for programs/grants which are not being used and ask the opinion of the Council on whether to eliminate or change these programs.

Wilke asked if the standards for the grant applications could be lowered or if the language in the grants application is not clear. Using “plain language” explaining the grant funding might increase the number of applications.

B. Reading asked the Council for suggestions for new grant areas. Rickerson said one area to explore would be to encourage library groups to form and meet together. Parker

said this had been done in the past and could be done again. The money involved is minimal but the benefits are great.

Information on FY06 state program funds for public libraries (State Aid, MOREnet fees, A&E funds) – Sara Parker, State Librarian

Parker gave a briefing on how the appropriations from the legislature will affect public libraries. State aid per capita puts money into the libraries serving the largest populations. Equalization puts money into the poorest counties. The distribution of the A&E funds was intended to put money into smaller municipal libraries who do not benefit greatly from the other two programs.

- MOREnet reductions (House Bill 3)

The reductions affected Internet access and the Missouri backbone which public libraries share with MOREnet's other users.

MOREnet funding has always been a combination of state funds plus fees from the memberships paid by MOREnet users. Public libraries' fees are based on their amount of public revenues.

MOREnet had to decide how the cuts would be made. The cost of Internet access was divided between the schools, libraries, and academic institutions based on use.

MOREnet also did a considerable amount of internal reduction. Over a million dollars was absorbed by MOREnet operations internally. After the school and academic funding and the internal reductions in MOREnet were established, there was a \$1.7 million dollar shortfall which had to be passed on to participants in higher fees. The MOREnet Council decided to allocate the \$1.7 million dollars based on the amount of bandwidth each of the clients use.

For public libraries this meant approximately \$200,000 would be required in higher fees. The public library fee structure is tiered. More tiers were added. A chart will be sent to public libraries explaining the increased fees.

- State Aid

\$1 million was cut in state aid. This affects both per capita and equalization funds.

There were five scenarios considered to allocate state aid. The scenarios ranged from keeping the per capita state aid at \$0.55 and eliminating the equalization program to a \$0.41 per capita, leaving less than \$1 million in equalization.

The scenario chosen was to reduce state aid to \$0.41 per capita.

- Out of State Athletes and Entertainers' Tax

\$100,000 was allocated for libraries from the Out of State Athletes and Entertainers' Tax (A&E). This will be distributed as follows:

- 30% will go to thirteen libraries with the largest collections
- \$325 will go to each of the other libraries
- \$162.50 will be allocated for each branch facility

Parker said a letter will be mailed next week to the public libraries on the allocation of the reductions.

House Bill 12 had no reductions in funding for the REAL appropriation. REAL finds public libraries' connectivity and the electronic licenses.

FY07 Budget Requests for Libraries – Mark R. Reading

M. Reading said within the next couple of weeks the Secretary of State's Office will develop the proposals for the FY07 budget requests.

There is concern about the FY06 budget. The State had to borrow money from the reserves for cash operating purposes almost within a week of the beginning of the FY06 year.

Fares advised to start advocating earlier. The time to begin would be with the special session.

Parker said the University of Missouri did not submit a request for restoration of either the MOBIUS or MOREnet funds.

Should Missouri have a statewide "Friends of Libraries" organization – Wicky Sleight, President Elect of the Missouri Library Association (MLA) and Kirkwood Public Library Director

Sleight said Missouri is one of the few states without a statewide "Friends of Libraries" organization.

There are five reasons why Missouri needs one:

- Best advocates for legislation concerning libraries.
- To increase membership in the Missouri Library Association.
- To serve as a conduit for libraries' needs.

- A source of support and help for libraries who would like to start a Friends group.
- A Friends of Missouri Libraries would help increase the visibility of Missouri libraries in a positive way.

There are 86 public libraries in the state which have Friends groups as well as some academic and special libraries. A statewide “Friends Group” would need to be careful not to interfere or take away from the effort of individual library Friends.

Maxwell asked if other states have had problems with their Friends having their own agenda and putting it before the betterment of the libraries. Sleight said this would need to be monitored. If the statewide group were a part of MLA, MLA might be able to monitor and control.

Overview/discussion on Public Library Standards and the implementation plan – Glenda Davis-Hunt and Carol Grimes

Parker said this was a follow-up to Council interest on public library standards.

Grimes detailed the process of how the standards were developed and written. She and Davis-Hunt served on the committee for writing the standards for public libraries. The primary factor for creating the standards for public libraries was to better define public library services and accountability.

The working group felt strongly the benefits for the library community as a whole would be important. Public library standards were collected from other states and evaluated for adaptability to Missouri. Many of the standards were quantitative and Missouri wanted a qualitative tool that would help reach a common understanding.

The committee also wanted to provide a tool that would strongly encourage planning and evaluation as an important process in offering library services.

It was hoped the standards would:

- Stimulate the growth and development of public libraries and provide a tool to assist in developing goals.
- Motivate the improvement of quality and effectiveness of service.
- Develop a concern and appreciation for the necessity of evaluation and public accountability.
- Serve as a reminder all Missouri citizens need and deserve quality library service.

Davis-Hunt reported on comments received from a survey regarding the standards. Participants were asked if they used the standards and how were they used. The responses said they were used for policy development, library board member responsibilities, goals and objectives for libraries, and for developing policy/operation manuals for libraries.

Fridley commented elementary school libraries are better now than private school libraries. This is due to the library standards.

Davis-Hunt asked for the library directors for their recommendations. Some of the suggestions received were:

- Create a checklist with core requirements – those that have to be met, plus a choice of three additional accomplishments.
- Give a time for completion – suggestion of three years.
- Decide on core requirements and reconvene the standards planning committee.

Planning and standards grants – Barbara Reading

To assist libraries with complying with standards, the State Library designed a grant opportunity which has been offered for the last four years. It is the “Planning and Standards Grant.”

The grant funds community surveys, focus groups, and strategic planning. There have not been many applications for this grant. Thirteen different projects were funded. The majority were for some type of survey. Four were for writing specific plans to address users’ needs.

State Librarian’s Report – Sara Parker

Parker distributed an updated list of the Council members.

Parker said she has received e-mail from three of the states affected by Hurricane Katrina. The Alabama State Librarian said they suffered damage, their resources are in place and to please concentrate on the other two states as they are the ones in desperate need.

The State Librarian from Mississippi sent out a listing of public libraries and the amount of damage done. The State Librarian in Louisiana still has a number of parishes she has been unable to contact.

People are pouring into the public libraries which are still open and using computer access for sending messages to families, completing FEMA papers online, and for children’s services. The libraries which are open in Louisiana have extended their hours to accommodate patrons.

Parker distributed an article from Washington University on “Pinpointing Preservation Possibilities.” This is an article about using collection analysis to determine digitization targets.

Parker also distributed a series of articles from the Columbia Tribune titled “Inappropriate Reading.” It is a series of five articles on censorship and banned books written by journalism students at the University of Missouri.

Approval of Minutes from June 10, 2005 meeting:

Maxwell moved the minutes be approved as presented. Shaw seconded. Motion carried.

Adjournment:

Carr adjourned the meeting at 2:30 p.m.

Dates for the 2005 Council Meetings:

December 9, 2005 – Daniel Boone Regional Library in Columbia